PATENT
PF020015

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action of June 5, 2007, as well as an Advisory Action issued October 17, 2007, have been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Applicants have assumed that an amendment after final filed October 3, 2007, has been entered by referring to the PAIR web site; (the Advisory Action appears to be unclear as to whether the amendment after final was entered indicating only that the amendment would be entered "for purposes of appeal" but a copy in PAIR indicates that the amendment was to be entered).

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the "first secret specific to said first domain" is different from "the second secret specific to said second domain." This second key is supported in the present specification as K_{n2} where n2 refers to a second domain different from a domain n1. The Examiner first reads the second secret specific to a second domain on a public key $K_{PUB.LOC}$ which is not a secret specific to a second domain (see Page 4 of FOA of June 5, 2007). Indeed, the very language teaches that the public key is public – "a local public key of the network $K_{PUB.LOC}$." The examiner cannot fairly call this key a "second secret specific to said second domain." The Examiner is referred to QUES page 10, ll. 14-15 – "the local public key of the network."

In his advisory action, the Examiner changes his position to reading the second secret on $K_{PRI.LOC}$ referring the reader to page 9, lines 28-34. PUB and PRI are both local to a presentation device and form a public key, private key pair but, as discussed above, do not represent "domain" secrets. "Domain" secrets are not disclosed or suggested by QUES. There also must be a "first secret specific to said first domain," and it is unclear what the Examiner considers to be QUES's "first secret specific to said first domain." The examiner must read claim 1 as a whole and, thus, has failed to make a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness. Consequently, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be reconsidered.

The Examiner cannot read out the plain language of the claim – "the second secret specific to said second domain" in clear parallel form to a first secret specific to a first domain. QUES teaches a *presentation device* specific pair of public and private keys – not *domain* driven *different* keys – see pages 12-13, for example, where there is a K_{pub2} and a K_{pub3} pair with a K_{pri3} and these subscripts refer to presentation devices 2 and 3 of Figure 3.

- 5 -

Moreover, the main claim 1 has been amended to recite features discussed, for example, at p. 7, ll.'s 24-36 and elsewhere regarding so-called viewing control information: "transmitting a portion of data in the clear containing viewing control information indicative of a right of said presentation device to copy received data." QUES and Ford are silent about such a feature recited in claim 1.

The Examiner reads claim 5 which further describes a "domain identifier" on "key K serving to decrypt the control words (CW)." Again, the Examiner completely misconstrues what a "domain" is. A "domain" cannot be read on a key and, moreover, a "domain" cannot be read on a presentation device. Moreover, a "domain identifier" serving to identify a domain certainly cannot be read on a key. There is no teaching or suggestion of transmitting a "domain identifier" as a portion of encrypted data (reading in step (a)). A key would be used to encrypt the domain identifier which, by reading claim 5 together with claim 1, clearly suggests that the domain identifier represents something other than an encryption key – namely "encrypted data" per claim 1.

Claim 6 has been added to recite a feature described in the specification, for example, at page 7, ll.'s 33-36: "initially applying a hash function to said portion of encrypted data and said portion of data transmitted in the clear prior to encryption of said portion of encrypted data." Applying a hash function as recited to both portions of data prior to encryption is not taught by either QUES or Ford.

Claim 7 has been added to recite the feature: "wherein said domain comprises a local domestic network of presentation devices." Support is found at least at page 6, lines 33-36. A local domestic network is just what it means. See also page 8, lines 29-31, "The portable presentation installations (for example compressed music file readers) are considered to form part of the domain N1 when they contain the secret key K_{N1}." Then, later on page 8, the user may want to view content on "another domain which will be called N2." Again, the Examiner does not appear to understand what a recited "domain" is.

- 6 -

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance with claims 1 and 4-7, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 609-734-6440.

Respectfully submitted,

ALAIN DURAND

By: _Catherine A Ferguson_
Catherine A. Ferguson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,877
609/734-6440

CAF:pdf

THOMSON LICENSING LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028

November 1, 2007

- 7 -